

Appl. No. : 10/671,386
Filed : September 25, 2003

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, Applicant has amended the application as above. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

Claim 4-7 and 11-25 (previously withdrawn from consideration) have been cancelled. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been amended. Claims 26-27 have been added. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 26-27 are pending in this application. The amendments to Claims 1 and 8 are supported, for example, by Figure 3. The amendments to Claims 2-3 and 9-10 are merely for clarification, and do not narrow the scope of protection. New Claims 26-27 are supported, for example, by Figure 3. Thus, the amendments to the claims do not introduce any new matter. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Terunuma (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,177). The Examiner has also rejected Claims 4-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shim (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,261). In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant has cancelled Claims 4-7. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 3 are allowable over Terunuma as discussed below.

Standard of Anticipation

“For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.” *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 850 F.ed 675, 677, 7 USPQ 2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Discussion of Patentability of Claims 1 and 3

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites, among other things, a first clip piece *with a hole* and a second clip piece connected to said first clip and *substantially located within said*

Appl. No. : 10/671,386
Filed : September 25, 2003

hole. However, the Terunuma reference does not disclose the above-recited features as discussed below.

The Examiner asserts that a clip (42) of the Terunuma device corresponds to the claimed first and second clip pieces. However, Terunuma does not disclose the first and second clip pieces of the claimed invention. In the claimed invention, the first clip piece has a hole and the second clip piece is substantially located in the hole. In contrast, the clip (42) of Terunuma is a solid piece and does not have a hole. Furthermore, since Terunuma discloses a solid clip piece, the prior art reference cannot disclose that the second clip piece is substantially located within the hole. *See Figures 1 and 6.*

In view of the above, Terunuma does not disclose the above-recited features of the claimed invention. Thus, the Terunuma reference does not show every element of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable over Terunuma. Claim 3 depends from base Claim 1, and further defines additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of the base claim, and in further view of the additional technical features, Claim 3 is patentable over the cited reference.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Terunuma in view of Shim and/or Yamatani (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,103). Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 6 and 8-10 are allowable over the prior art references as discussed below.

Standard of *Prima facie* Obviousness

In order to provide a *prima facie* showing of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See, e.g., In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974); MPEP 2143.03.

Patentability of Claims 2 and 8-10

Independent Claim 8, as amended, recites, among other things, a first clip piece *with a hole* and a second clip piece connected to said first clip and *substantially located within said hole*. As discussed above, Terunuma does not disclose the above-indicated features. Shim does not teach the above-recited feature, either. Shim at best discloses a solid snap (16) which secures a substrate (14) to a monitor body (14). *See column 4, lines 1-12 and Figure 4*. Thus, Claim 8 is allowable over Terunuma and Shim.

Claims 2 and 10 depend from base Claim 1 and 8, respectively, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. Furthermore, Yamatani does not remedy the deficiency of either Terunuma or Shim. In view of the patentability of their base claims, and in further view of their additional technical features, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

Discussion of Patentability of New Claims

New Claim 26 includes all of the features of Claim 1, and further includes that the first and second clip pieces are a part of a frame, wherein the flexible printed circuit board is secured to the frame by the fasteners. Terunuma does not disclose this feature. In Terunuma, the clip (42) is not a part of a single mounting board (20), arguably corresponding to the claimed frame. Instead, the clip (42) is a separate element from the mounting board (20). *See Figures 1 and 6*.

New Claim 27 includes all of the features of Claim 1, and further includes that both of the first and second clip pieces extend from a frame, wherein the flexible printed circuit board is secured to the frame by the fasteners. Terunuma does not disclose the above-recited features of the claimed invention. In Terunuma, the clip (42) does not contact the mounting board (20) since the flexible printed circuit board (41) is located between the clip (42) and the mounting board (20). *See Figures 1 and 6*.

In view of the patentability of their base claim, and in further view of their distinguished additional technical features, Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 26-27 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Appl. No. : 10/671,386
Filed : September 25, 2003

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicant's foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____

9/14/03

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

1888389
082405